

REMARKS

Claims 1, 7, and 12 have been amended to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the present invention. Claims 1-14 remain for consideration.

In the last Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-4, 6-9 and 11-13 as being unpatentable over Nardin in view of Lyons (6,075,798), and claims 5, 10 and 14 as being unpatentable over Nardin and Lyons further in view of Lyons (6,282,196). However, the applicants submit that Examiner's reasons for these rejections are actually in error and reconsideration in view of the above amendment and the following arguments is requested.

First of all, the Examiner erroneously contended that the step (c) of claim 1 is equivalent to the elements 156 and 158 of Fig. 2 of Nardin.

However, as clarified in the above amendment, the step (c) of claim 1 actually requires dynamically changing a compression scheme of each input signal into a most appropriate compression scheme selected from a plurality of different compression schemes with different compression rates, according to the silence information and the signal type information.

In contrast, the elements 156 and 158 of Nardin only apply a single predetermined compression scheme to all the voice data, that is the G.721 adaptive differential PCM algorithm. Note here that Nardin refers to this compression as selectable only because it can be selectively turned ON/OFF such that the compression is only applied to the voice data and not to the other data such as modem and facsimile data (see col. 5, lines 1 to 10). Nardin clearly fails to disclose any teaching for dynamically changing a compression scheme of each input signal into a most

appropriate compression scheme selected from a plurality of different compression schemes with different compression rates, according to the silence information and the signal type information.

Next, the Examiner also erroneously contended that the signal type is determined by Nardin's NTC (Network Trunk Card) 182. However, Nardin clearly describes the functions of this NTC 182 as queuing the cells, performing network cell framing and deframing, and performing physical layer convergence function (see col. 5, lines 15-24). None of these functions actually described by Nardin is a determination of the signal type (see col. 5, lines 11-24).

Note also that the NTC 182 is a part of the trunk network interface group 180 for coupling data from MUXBUS 183, to a cell network trunk 20 (see col. 5, lines 11-14), which has nothing to do with the voice data compression (which is done by the voice data PAD unit (VDP) 150). In particular, Nardin completely fails to disclose any teaching for using a signal type or whatever else that is obtained by the NTC 182 specifically for the purpose of dynamically changing a compression scheme in the voice data compression.

Next, the Examiner correctly admitted that Nardin fails to disclose the steps (d) and (e) of claim 1, but then erroneously contended that these steps are disclosed in Lyons ('798). Nardin actually describes that "each packet being assembled and disassembled is a fixed length packet" (see col. 4, lines 26-27), so that the Examiner's attempt to incorporate these missing features of assembling variable length packets and assembling ATM cells by multiplexing such variable length packets into Nardin from any other reference is actually contradictory to Nardin's disclosure, and therefore there is no sound motivation for a person skilled in the art to contemplate such combination.

Moreover, Lyons only discloses the use of an extended header for an AAL-2 header of an ATM cell of a fixed size (53 octets), and actually fails to disclose any teaching for assembling variable length packets and assembling ATM cells by multiplexing such variable length packets. Thus, it is logically impossible for any combination of Nardin and Lyons to imply the steps (d) and (e) of claim 1, especially in the context of transferring speech and voice band signals and ISDN digital signals between an ATM network and an STM network, as explicitly recited in claim 1.

The combination of Nardin and Lyons proposed by the Examiner fails to suggest or teach the data transfer between the ATM and the STM, as explicitly recited in claim 1, and therefore the Examiner's rejection based on Nardin and Lyons is totally groundless.

The same arguments apply to all the dependent claims 2-6 of claims 1, as well as the transmitting side device claims 7-11 and the receiving side device claims 12-14, that are corresponding to the method claims 1-6.

In conclusion, it is believed that claims 1-14 are patentably distinct over the prior art of record. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present amendment are solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 8, 2003

By: Seymour Rothstein

Seymour Rothstein
(Reg. No. 19,369)

OLSON & HIERL, LTD.
20 North Wacker Drive, 36th Floor
Chicago, IL 60606
(312) 580-1180

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this paper and its attachments are being deposited with the United States Postal Service on the date shown below with sufficient postage as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to: BOX AF, COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS, WASHINGTON, D.C. 20231 on April 8, 2003.

Seymour Rothstein
Seymour Rothstein